

## Presentation Script

### Abstract from Program

In 2013, 36 Indiana academic libraries came together to take part in the ALI/PALNI Shared Print Project. By sharing their resources, the libraries were able to engage Sustainable Collection Services to analyze the circulating print monographs of each library individually and as a whole. The Project has both short-term and long-term goals. In the short-term, libraries are able to make data-driven decisions about weeding their collections and reclaim space for student use. As we look to the future, the Project can also be the foundation for a shared collection mindset and allow greater cooperative collection development. This year's keynote address will share background on the ALI/PALNI Shared Print Project, the results to date, and plans for the future.

### 1. TITLE - Kirsten

Thank you for inviting us to speak on the ALI/PALNI Shared Print project as part of your theme "Sharing Resources and Showing Results". As Executive Director of PALNI, a library cooperative based on sharing resources, I am delighted to be here to talk about this state-wide project to share collections. With me is my partner in crime, Tina Baich from IUPUI who has served as our Project Coordinator, who has made this vision a reality.

### 2. KIRSTEN – WHY SHARED PRINT?

Why do this project? Did we just feel like sharing? Too much Mr. Rogers in our childhoods? We had a number of "pain points" and desires that couldn't be managed within a single library or even the 23 libraries of PALNI.

We had:

- Shifting needs of users and demands on library space from external units
- Expanding collections with little hope for an expanding library
- A desire to highlight unique collections rather than commonly held
- Constricting budgets require greater collaboration / resource sharing
- Ensure preservation of what makes our collections unique

### 3. KIRSTEN - THE BIRTH OF A PROJECT

The ALI-PALNI Shared Print Project was conceived and championed by Academic Libraries of Indiana presidents Dan Howell from Taylor University and David Lewis from IUPUI.

Started with Dan Howell talking about shared journal collections about 10 years ago. It took years for the timing, need, and technology to all come together to make a shared print project feasible.

The Task Force for Shared Print Explorations was formed in October 2012.

- 1) To explore models for shared print management among other academic library consortia
  - 2) To explore options for cooperative analysis of print/physical collections
  - 3) To recommend next steps for ALI libraries interested in initiating a shared print management project
  - 4) To present the recommendation above to the ALI Board by January 31, 2013
- David Lewis served as Chair of this TF and later became ALI President.

## Presentation Script

### 4. KIRSTEN – VISION TO REALITY

To date, this shared print project had the largest number of partners. We were able to do so because we had several large scale financial support partners. PALNI agreed to go all in and fund all 23 libraries centrally through reserve funds. This made the project more viable in the eyes of other institutions and made it attractive for grant funding.

Dan Bowell and David Lewis made an initial approach with the Lilly Endowment and then worked with Kirsten Leonard to develop a grant proposal to the Endowment, which funded the project.

Additional funding came from ALI with the remainder of the cost covered by individual participating libraries based on the number of records submitted for analysis.

Sustainable Collection Services (SCS) was contracted to conduct the data analysis. We now had a proven and robust tool for doing this level of data analysis

PALNI serves as the fiscal agent for the project.

Tina Baich serves as the project coordinator.

### 5. TINA - PROJECT PARTNERS

All 23 PALNI libraries participated in the project along with 13 other ALI libraries including 7 IU system libraries. The map shows that the participants hailed from every corner of the state.

### 6. TINA - PROJECT GOALS

The project goals parallel the environmental characteristics that have lead libraries to engage in Shared Print in states and regions across the country.

For most libraries the primary goals were to weed their print collections in order to free up space, but they wanted to be able to do so with minimal impact on users. Participating in this project gave them access to an analysis of their collection in conjunction with circulation statistics allowing them to make data-driven decisions.

A secondary goal was to identify what the participants held that other in the state did not. What should these libraries preserve and protect?

Longer-term goals were to see what we could learn so we could acquire in a more deliberate fashion so we weren't needing to do a big project like this again – so looking at what we could learn that an individual library could use in their acquisition, and what we might want to do for a statewide strategy.

Yet with all these lofty goals, the libraries wanted a project with low overhead and minimal staff obligations. Most are stretched thin and didn't want anything to make them thinner.

Provide participating libraries an opportunity to reduce their print collections with minimal impact on library users;

Allow participating libraries to reclaim space for other purposes more directly beneficial to library users;

## **Presentation Script**

Identify unique print items within the collections of participating libraries for preservation and potential digitization;

Inform and influence ongoing collection development at the individual libraries; and

Develop a statewide strategy for print book collections, which may involve cooperative purchasing.

### **7. TINA - PROJECT SCOPE**

ONLY circulating print monographs [unlike many shared print projects, which have focused on journals]

### **8. TINA - POLICY GROUP**

Due to the number of participants, a representative twelve-member Policy Group was formed. This group was constituted in November 2013 in preparation for decision making that would be required in early 2014. The Policy Group met four times over the course of spring 2014 and engaged in further discussions over email to make several key decisions including the selection of libraries and groups of libraries to which the participant libraries' collections would be compared (February 2014).

In the course of our deliberations, the Policy Group consulted the decision-making and actions of other projects and gain general knowledge of Shared Print Projects from a variety of sources. PAN, Maine Shared Collections, MI-SPI, VIVA as Policy Group worked on decisions

### **9. TINA - HANDSHAKE = POLICY DECISIONS: RETENTION COMMITMENTS**

Most Shared Print initiatives incorporate formal retention commitments into the process. To inform the Policy Group's discussion on this topic, I gathered information about the 3 major research libraries' retention policies and example MOUs from other projects. However, it quickly became clear that the group was uncomfortable with the amount of time and staff the implementation of formal retention commitments would require. There was also a concern that trying to get approval of a formal MOU by 36 libraries would slow, if not stop, the project. Instead, the Policy Group established an informal agreement that participating libraries will not weed any items classified as scarcely held at this time – a virtual handshake if you will.

### **10. TINA - SCARCE DEFINITION = POLICY DECISIONS: DEFINING SCARCELY-HELD**

In order to determine what we could weed and what we should retain, the Policy Group had to settle on a definition of scarcely-held. The group considered 9 scenarios that spanned the spectrum of liberal to conservative with the most liberal allowing for the withdrawal of 92% of circulating print collections (Scenario 3) and the most conservative 53%. The criteria the Policy Group settled on put us on the conservative end of the spectrum with 67% available for withdrawal.

## Presentation Script

### [CLICK]

The criteria chosen protected items that were:

Held by fewer than 4 libraries within the state of Indiana (exact edition)

OR

Held by fewer than 20 libraries in the US (exact edition)

OR

Not held by at least one of IU Bloomington, Purdue, or Notre Dame

By adding the criterion of being held by one of those three libraries, the group ensured that a copy remained in Indiana outside the participant group.

The Policy Group will soon be reconvening to discuss ways to allow further weeding within the universe of scarcely-held items perhaps by identifying specific categories of items that can be weeded without danger.

### 11. TINA - PROJECT TIMELINE

While the roots of the project go back to 2011 and earlier, the project timeline begin in October 2013 with a kick-off meeting and was quite aggressive.

Sustainable Collection Services and the Project Coordinator, that's me, were contracted in November 2013. That same month the Policy Group was formed.

The data questionnaires required by SCS were all submitted in December and data sets began going in to SCS shortly thereafter.

The Policy Group continued to meet through the Spring of 2014 and individual libraries reviewed initial data summaries in April. By July 2014, all the participating libraries had access to their data in GreenGlass, SCS' online data analysis tool. That same month we held a participant meeting to provide instruction, etc. Since then, the libraries have been acting on the data and Kirsten, David Lewis, and I have been considering next steps.

### 12. TINA – PROJECT RESULTS SO FAR

With 19 of the 36 libraries reporting to date, participants have weeded or plan to weed approximately 179,400 volumes, which translates to approximately 12,835 square feet of reclaimed space.

### 14. TINA – BUTLER SPACE USE

And libraries are starting to put all that space to better use. Butler will be bringing in the Center for Academic Technology into Irwin Library in Summer/Fall which will be replacing an area of the library previously used by book stacks that were weeded for the project. Butler has had a pressing need to prioritize their collection which had not been weeded in many years. They had been doing weeding previous to the project to free space for collaborative learning spaces as

## Presentation Script

you see below, but the process was time-consuming and wasn't part of a cooperative effort to ensure access in the state.

### 15. TINA- SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE AND U INDY

Other libraries have created more informal and formal student study spaces; shifted to create more room within the stacks to alleviate overcrowding and to allow integration of branch library collections; relocated the campus Writing Center to the library; or weeded in anticipation of planned renovations.

Future plans include more individual and group study spaces and rooms; a quiet reading room; a new instructional classrooms and labs; and relocation of academic support services to the library.

### 16. KIRSTEN – FUTURE PROJECTS

Digitization project – with some leftover funding from Lilly we had already proposed identifying Indiana-themed scarcely held titles to digitize to improve access.

A meeting was held on May 15, 2015, to discuss possible collection development collaboration among ALI libraries. Genya O'Gara, the Director of Collections at James Madison University and steering member on [The Virtual Library of Virginia \(VIVA\)](#) Monographic Collection Analysis Task Force, spoke on VIVA's use of the SCS data to identify e-book collections to acquire jointly, effective DDA characteristics like shelf life, local disciplinary strengths, and print and e-book usage patterns. Ruth Fischer from SCS followed up with some examples of VIVA's analysis using our project data.

Out of the discussion we identified these possible projects

Consortial eDDA project

Consortial ebook package

Subject specialization

Print floating collection

### 17. KIRSTEN - LOOKING FOR INTERSECTIONS

Virtual Library of Virginia (VIVA)

72 academic libraries (39 public, 32 private, Library of Virginia), including doctorals, four years, two years, and specialized institutions.

Looking at what is held commonly and widely used to identify shared ebook publisher candidates

Defined as:

- held by 10 or more VIVA libraries
- 10 or more recorded uses
- last charge date after 200

This led us to discuss another possibility that we are considering - looking at widely purchased but little used books that can be purchased as a group ebook purchase to handle the "just in case" rather than everyone purchasing them.

## **Presentation Script**

VIVA also looked at how subject areas of speciality were allocated amongst the project participants which was of interest to the group.

### **18. KIRSTEN – RESOURCE SHARING**

Who benefits from resource sharing and how?

Tina and I were thrilled at the great interest that we saw in our May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. Purdue, IUB, and Notre Dame were as interested in getting access to a broader range of material without increased costs as were the smallest school.

The May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting has established a “foundation for a shared collection mindset and allow greater cooperative collection development” that has been building within ALI and also with interactions with Michigan, Ohio, and Illinois consortia executive directors.

This project has been as much about building deeper collaboration at the state level and beginning thinking about regional collaboration as it is about preservation and weeding. We have begun to build the mechanisms, trust, resources, and platforms for more collaboration on collections – to an enhanced collection mindset. The resources shared to accomplish this project – expertise, funds – are leading us to more collaboration – cooperative collection development and an enhanced shared collection mindset.

We are now able to rely more on each other because of mechanisms in place and forthcoming – statewide courier and potential Statewide Remote Circulation System (SRCS) to allow unmediated patron requesting through a union catalog model

What statewide collaborations or regional collaborations would you like to see?

### **PHOTO CREDITS**

### **QUESTIONS**